

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 18, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered by the Applicants. In the Office Action, claims 1-23 and 28-43 are currently pending. Claims 2, 31, 35, 39 and 43 are withdrawn from consideration. New claims 44-47 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-23, 28-30, 32-34, 36-38, 40-42, and 44-47 are at issue.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-23, 28-30, 32-34, 36-38 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,463 Godfrey et al. ("Godfrey") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,868 to Raff ("Raff"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 includes, among other features, "a group calendar comprising one or more calendar events created by at least one member of the group by entering calendar information into a new calendar event view." Similarly, claim 12 includes the feature, "the family calendar including a plurality of calendar entries created by at least one member of the family by entering calendar information into a new calendar event view." Claim 17 includes, "the family calendar which comprises one or more calendar events created by at least one member of a family by entering calendar information into a new calendar event view." Claim 21 includes, "a family calendar comprising one or more calendar events created by at least one member of the group by entering calendar information into a new calendar event view."

Applicants submit that neither Godfrey nor Raff discloses, teaches, or suggests creation of calendar events "by entering calendar information into a new calendar event view," as recited in all the rejected claims. Godfrey does not disclose this claimed feature, and indeed, the Office Action does not attempt to point to such disclosure in Godfrey. Raff also does not disclose this feature, and thus, does not remedy this deficiency of Godfrey. The Office Action asserts that Raff discloses this feature, but does not point to any such disclosure in Raff or otherwise support the assertion. Upon analysis of Raff, it is unclear how calendar events are created. The specification of Raff does not disclose that new information is entered via a new calendar event view. Also, FIGS. 6, 10A-12B, and 16-19 all show screen shots of a palmtop computer system, but none show a new calendar event view. FIG. 11A and the relevant description in the

specification (Col. 11, Lns. 19-27) indicate that modifications to the information are made using “on-screen editing,” without the use of a different or separate new calendar event view. Thus, because neither of the cited references discloses, teaches, or suggests this feature of independent claims 1, 12, 17, and 21, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to these claims, nor the dependent claims therefrom.

As an additional matter, and as Applicants have similarly described in previous responses, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Godfrey and Raff is improper and fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because there is no motivation to combine Godfrey and Raff given that the systems disclosed in the two references are based on entirely different underlying architectures. Godfrey discloses a “push” architecture where updated calendar information is sent to a wireless device based on trigger events, whereas Raff discloses synchronization through accessing and downloading information from a shared database. Applicants submit that the Office Action fails to cite to any motivation in Godfrey or Raff to make the combination, nor does the Office Action explain how the combination of such different systems would be successful. Rather, the Office Action merely offers the unsupported assertion, “[I]t would provide efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless users in a system that pushes updates to a plurality of wireless users.” (Office Action, p. 3). Applicants submit that the “push” architecture of Godfrey does not allow for a group of wireless devices to have “equal access” to a group calendar. Instead, Godfrey discloses messages that are pushed under the control of redirection software based on trigger events. It is well-established that “one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.” *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075 (Fed. Cir. 1988). However, by selecting elements from two very different systems, without regard to whether the features of those systems are compatible, this is exactly what has been done here. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Godfrey and Raff is improper, and no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to the rejected claims.

New Claims

New claims 44-47 have been added by the present Amendment. Support for these claims can be found, for example, at p. 16, lns. 10-13 of the specification. Applicants submit that new


claims 44-47 contain additional elements not disclosed in the cited references, and thus, are patentable for additional reasons independent of those stated above with respect to claims 1, 12, 17, and 21. For example, claim 44 contains the feature, “the server further provides an individual calendar comprising ... one or more private calendar events created by a member of the group ... each private calendar event being retrievable and modifiable by one of the plurality of wireless devices associated with the member.” Neither Godfrey nor Raff discloses this element of claim 44. In particular, Raff indicates that the system is designed so that all of the calendar information stored on the server is shared and modifiable by any user. (Raff, Col. 11, Lns. 7-18). Claims 45-47 contain similar features as that discussed above with respect to claim 44. Accordingly, claims 44-47 are independently patentable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the rejected claims in this application is respectfully requested. Additionally, examination and allowance of new claims 44-47 is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 18, 2007

By: 
Gregory G. Schlenz
Registration No. 55,597
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive,
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001

1196744